

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

No Claims has been amended. No Claims has been cancelled without prejudice. No Claims has been added.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-7, 9, and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,415,323 (hereinafter “McCanne”) in view of U.S. Patent 6,611,872 (hereinafter “McCanne-2”). The Applicants respectfully disagree, and submit the following arguments in support of their position.

As understood by the Applicants, McCanne relates to a redirection system for handling client requests. Furthermore, as understood by the Applicants, McCanne-2 relates to application-level multicasting in a router.

In contrast, claim 1, as amended, requires “mapping the URL to a corresponding unicast address for the information object; and using the unicast address as an anycast address.” In his response to Applicants arguments – specifically in paragraph 11 of Final Office Action – the Examiner asserts that “McCanne discloses using the unicast address (SN1, receive the information over unicast col 19, lines 65-67) as an anycast address (thus far relied on anycast address, col 20 lines 5-12).

While the words “unicast” and “anycast” appear in proximity in the text, the Examiner’s out of context quotation completely distorts the teaching of McCanne. First, the two sentences quoted appear under two different headings, and thus two separate topics of discussion. The first sentence reads: “Simultaneously, the service node SN0 would contact an upstream service node

SN1 to receive the information content over a unicast connection.” Under a different heading, the second sentence reads: “The system described thus far has relied on anycast routing to route client requests to the nearest service nodes.”

Thus, the first sentence discusses unicast messaging between two service nodes, while the second sentence discusses anycast routing between a client and a service node. However, these two sentences, taken separately, do not teach or suggest “mapping the URL to a corresponding unicast address for the information object; and using the unicast address as an anycast address,” as required by claim 1.

The sections of McCanne and McCanne-2 cited by the Examiner to teach these limitations are only related to unicasting and multicasting. McCanne at the paragraph beginning at Col 19 Line 63 discusses fan points to replicate multicast traffic, while the service nodes communicate using unicast connections. Client request can be routed using anycast routing.

Similarly, McCanne-2 at Col 25 Line 51 describes redirecting unicast initiated traffic to a multicast overlay group. At Col 19 Line 65, McCanne-2 discusses loop avoidance as related to multicasting and offers an application-based solution to loop avoidance using consistency checks. However, neither McCanne nor McCanne 2 teaches “using the unicast address as an anycast address,” as required by claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is allowable. Furthermore, claim 3-8 that depend on claim 1 and add further limitations are also allowable.

Claims 7 and 9 include limitations similar to those of allowable claim 1. Therefore claims 7 and 9 are also allowable. Similarly, claims 11-14, which depend on allowable claim 9 adding further limitations are also allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Adam Furst at (408) 947-8200.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: April 28, 2005

Adam Furst
Reg. No. 51,710



12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 947-8200